

REMARKS

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 27-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,363,421 issued to Barker et al. (*Barker*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,065,053 issued to Nouri, et al. (*Nouri*) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,738,388 issued to Stevenson et al. (*Stevenson*). Claims 6 and 31 have been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is moot. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that claims 1-3, 5, 7, 27-30 and 32 are not rendered obvious by *Barker*, *Nouri*, and *Stevenson*.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 7

Independent claim 1 recites, in a salient portion, the following:

receiving automatically a hardware-specific data control packet from the alert proxy in response to the transmission of the alert packet, the data control packet comprising one or more specified control operations to be performed on the client device **when the client device is in a system hung state**;

Barker fails to teach or disclose control operations to be performed on a client device when the client device is in a system hung state. *Nouri* is cited as disclosing a micro controller network “fly by wire” capability. Whether or not *Nouri* teaches the limitations cited in the Office action, *Nouri* fails to teach or disclose control operations to be performed on a client device when the client device is in a system hung state. Thus, *Nouri* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Barker*.

Stevenson is cited as disclosing a control system that automatically updates the dynamic and static parameters of a shadow function block. Whether or not *Stevenson* actually disclose the limitations cited in the Office action, *Stevenson* does not teach or disclose control operations to be performed on a client device when the client device is in a system hung state. Thus, *Stevenson* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Barker* and *Nouri*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits claim 1 is not obvious in view of *Barker*, *Nouri*, and *Stevenson*.

Claims 2-3, 5 and 7 depend from claim 1. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits that claims 2-3, 5 and 7 are not rendered obvious by *Barker*, *Nouri*, and *Stevenson* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 27-30 and 32

Independent claim 27 recites, in a salient portion, the following:

a network controller coupled to the alert module to transmit the alert packet to an alert proxy that is external to the client device and to automatically receive a hardware-specific data control packet from the alert proxy in response to the transmission of the alert packet, the data control packet comprising one or more specified control operations to be automatically performed on the client device **when the client device is in a system hung state.**

Thus, Applicant claims receiving a data control packet comprising one or more operations to be automatically performed on the client device when the device is in a system hung state.

Neither *Barker* nor *Nouri* teach or disclose a hardware-specific data control packet comprising one or more operations to be automatically performed on the client device when the device is in a system hung state. *Stevenson* is cited as disclosing a control system that automatically updates the dynamic and static parameters of a shadow function block. However, *Stevenson* does not teach or disclose a hardware-specific data control packet comprising one or more operations to be automatically performed on the client device when the device is in a system hung state. Thus, *Stevenson* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Barker* and *Nouri*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits claim 27 is not obvious in view of *Barker*, *Nouri*, and *Stevenson*.

Claims 28-30 and 32 depend from claim 27. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits that


claims 28-30 and 32 are not rendered obvious by *Barker, Nouri*, and *Stevenson* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, Applicant submits claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 27-30 and 32 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP


Jared S. Engstrom
Reg. No. 58,330

Date: March 12, 2007

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778